

Calabi-Yau-threefolds with Picard number $\rho(X) = 2$ and their Kähler cone I

Marco Kühnel*
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Bayreuth
 D-95440 Bayreuth

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We describe properties of the Kähler cone of general Calabi-Yau-threefolds with Picard number $\rho(X) = 2$ and prove the rationality of the Kähler cone, if X is a Calabi-Yau-hypersurface in a $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over $\mathbb{P}^2$ and $c_3(X) \leq -54$. Without the latter assumption we prove the positivity of $c_2(X)$.

1 Introduction

In this paper, a Calabi-Yau-threefold is a compact complex Kähler manifold of dimension three with $K_X = \mathcal{O}_X$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$.

Wilson stated in 1994 [Wi94b] a conjecture about the rationality of the Kähler cone of a Calabi-Yau-threefold. It says that the Kähler cone of a Calabi-Yau-threefold X is rational and finitely generated in $N^1(X)$, if $c_2(X)$ is positive, i.e. $D \cdot c_2(X) > 0$ for every nef divisor D .

In the present paper we deal with the case of Picard number $\rho(X) = 2$. If $X \rightarrow S$ is an elliptic fibration onto a smooth surface and $\rho(X) = 2$, then $S \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Oguiso proves in [Og93] that for every elliptic fibration $X \rightarrow S$, the surface S , smooth or not, is rational. Moreover, it is an easy argument to verify that $C = \mathbb{P}^1$, if $X \rightarrow C$ is a fibration onto a normal curve C and X a Calabi-Yau manifold. So it is natural to consider projective spaces as base spaces of Calabi-Yau-fibrations.

A rather complete picture about the Kähler cone should be obtained for those X which can be embedded in $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundles over $\mathbb{P}^m$ as hypersurfaces. Here we are considering the case $(n, m) = (2, 2)$, i.e. X is a family of cubic elliptic curves. We will prove the rationality of the Kähler cone for most cases:

Theorem 4.15. *Let $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rank-3-bundle, $Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, $X \subset |-K_Z|$ a Calabi-Yau-manifold with $\rho(X) = 2$ and $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$. Then $\partial K(X)$ is rational.*

There is also a topological criterion on X for the condition $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, which in particular includes all possible Z with $-K_Z$ nef (cf. Remark 4.17):

*The author acknowledges gratefully support by the DFG priority program 'Global Methods in Complex Geometry'.

Theorem 4.16. *Let $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ a rank-3-bundle, $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. If $c_3(X) \leq -54$, then $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, in particular $\partial K(X)$ is rational.*

To prove the rationality of $\partial K(X)$, we investigate, if

$$K(X) = K(Z)|X$$

holds, when Z denotes the $\mathbb{P}^n$ -bundle. A result of Kollár states, that this is right, if Z is Fano. We generalize this assumption and describe the situation, when $K(X) \neq K(Z)|X$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$, with $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ being a rank-3-bundle, and $\rho(X) = 2$. Then*

$$K(X) = K(Z)|X$$

holds, unless:

$-K_Z$ is big and nef, but not ample, $-K_Z|X$ is ample and there is a surface $G \subset Z$ such that $X \cap G = \emptyset$ and

$$[\mu G] = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - (6c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9)\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h + (9c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9 - 2c_1^2(\mathcal{E}))F$$

for a certain $\mu > 0$.

This part uses the bundle-situation only for the details of the description. Furthermore, we show that $\partial K(Z)$ is rational, if $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$. Hence, under this assumption, it remains to discuss the cases $K(X) \neq K(Z)|X$ to prove rationality of $\partial K(X)$. This is done by using some vector bundle theory, hence is essentially connected to the embedding into a $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundle over $\mathbb{P}^2$.

In the last part, we show

Theorem 4.18. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$, where $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a rank-3-bundle. Then*

$$D.c_2(X) > 0 \text{ for all } D \in \overline{K(X)}.$$

Thus we are confirming the Wilson conjecture for hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundles over $\mathbb{P}^2$ with $c_3(X) \leq -54$ and $\rho(X) = 2$. The positivity of $c_2(X)$ is also proved by using the bundle information widely.

The cases $(n, m) = (3, 1)$ and $(n, m) = (1, 3)$ are dealt with in a different paper. Moreover, the case of a family of quartic elliptic curves may be also interesting.

Calabi-Yau manifolds with $\rho(X) = 2$ are also considered in Mirror Symmetry as mirrors of two-parameter-families of Calabi-Yau manifolds, which are constructed to be able to choose a good one-parameter family.

This article grew out of the author's thesis at the University of Bayreuth. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Thomas Peternell for all his support and valuable advice.

2 Notation

In this section we summarize the most important notations of this paper. X will always denote a Calabi-Yau-threefold, while Z is a fourfold in every case.

$N^1(X)$	the $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space of numerical classes of $Div(X) \otimes \mathbb{R}$
$K(X)$	the open part of the Kähler cone of X , i.e. the ample cone
$B(X)$	the effective cone in $N^1(X)$
$W(X)$	the hypersurface $\{D^3 = 0\} \subset N^1(X)$
$\mathcal{O}_X(1)$	the restriction $\mathcal{O}_Z(1) _X$, where $\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$ is the tautological bundle associated to $Z = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$
K_Z	the canonical divisor of Z
$c_i(\mathcal{E})$	the i -th Chern class of a bundle $\mathcal{E}$
$c_i(M)$	the i -th Chern class of the tangent bundle of the complex manifold M

3 The Kähler cone of Calabi-Yau threefolds

If $X \xrightarrow{i} Z$ is a Calabi-Yau-threefold in a 4-fold Z , we want to know something about the relation of their Kähler cones. The easiest relation would be $i^*K(Z) = K(X)$. This situation we will denote by $K(X) = K(Z)|_X$. In [Bo89] Kollár proved such a result, if Z is Fano:

Lemma 3.1 (Kollár) *If Z is a Fano-4-fold and $X \in |-K_Z|$ a Calabi-Yau-manifold, then $i^* : N^1(Z) \longrightarrow N^1(X)$ is an isomorphism and $K(X) = K(Z)|_X$.*

One could hope that this result holds also, if $-K_Z$ is only big and nef instead of ample. This is wrong, as the following example shows.

Example 3.2 ($K(X) \neq K(Z)|_X$) Let $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ and $Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ with tautological bundle $\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$ and natural projection $p : Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$. Then $-K_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(3)$ is nef, globally generated and since

$$-K_Z^4 = 81(c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - c_2(\mathcal{E})) = 567 > 0,$$

$-K_Z$ is also big. The morphism

$$\Phi_{|-K_Z|} : Z \longrightarrow Z'$$

contracts $G := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}) \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ to a point z , where $\mathcal{O}$ is the first summand of $\mathcal{E}$, and is an isomorphism outside G . Since $-K_Z = \Phi^*\mathcal{L}$ for a globally generated line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on Z' , we can choose a smooth element $L \in |\mathcal{L}|$, such that

$$X := \phi^{-1}(L)$$

is smooth and $z \notin L$.

Now, if $C \subset Z$ is a curve with $\mathcal{O}_Z(1) \cdot C = 0$, then $C \subset G$. But since $X \cap G = \emptyset$, it follows $C \cap X = \emptyset$. This proves that $\mathcal{O}_X(1) := \mathcal{O}_Z(1)|_X$ is ample and hence

$$K(X) \neq K(Z)|_X.$$

Moreover, it is not hard to proof that

$$\overline{K(X)} = \mathbb{R}^+(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) + \mathbb{R}^+\pi^*h,$$

if we denote $\pi := p|_X$. △

One of the major steps to the rationality result, Theorem 4.6, states, that this example already shows the structure of all counterexamples in the case $(2, 2)$. But for the moment we are not going to specialize the situation. Instead, we want to see what happens, if $-K_Z$ is not nef. Indeed, the statement of the Kollár Lemma holds for the face of $K(Z)$ 'closer' to $-K_Z$:

Lemma 3.3 *Let Z be a 4-fold with $\rho(Z) = 2$ and assume $-K_Z$ is not nef. Moreover, let $X \in |-K_Z|$ be a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$ and $H \in \text{Pic}(Z)$ ample. If $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$, then*

$$H + r(-K_Z) \in \partial K(Z) \iff H + r(-K_Z)|_X \in \partial K(X).$$

Proof: Let E_1, E_2 be cone generators of $\overline{K(Z)}$ - i.e. generators of $N^1(Z)$ with $E_1, E_2 \in \partial K(Z)$ -, such that

$$-K_Z = E_1 - E_2.$$

Furthermore let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$D := E_1 - cE_2$$

is nef restricted to X . We get

$$-K_Z = D + (c - 1)E_2.$$

Hence $c \geq 1$ would imply that $-K_Z|_X$ is nef, therefore $-K_Z$ would be nef, what contradicts to the assumptions.

So we know $c < 1$. Now let $C \subset Z$ be a curve. If $C \subset X$, then by construction, $D.C \geq 0$.

If $C \not\subset X$, then $(-K_Z).C \geq 0$, since $X \in |-K_Z|$. Therefore

$$D.C = -K_Z.C + (1 - c)E_2.C \geq 0.$$

Hence D is nef. This means that $D = E_1$.

If now $H = h_1E_1 + h_2E_2$ is ample and $H + r(-K_Z)|_X \in \partial K(X)$ for $r > 0$, these considerations imply that

$$H + r(-K_Z) = (h_1 + r)E_1 + (h_2 - r)E_2 = (h_1 + h_2)E_1$$

and hence $H + r(-K_Z) \in \partial K(Z)$. □

Now the question is, if we can find $\mathbb{Q}$ -Divisors on $\partial K(X)$ and, moreover, if we can express every element of $K(X)$ as a finite sum of $\mathbb{R}$ -linear combinations of $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisors in $\partial K(X)$. The last property is called the rational generatedness (or short: rationality) of the Kähler cone and is only dependent on the lattice $\text{Pic}(X) \subset N^1(X)$, but not on a chosen basis of $\text{Pic}(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

First, we give a situation, in which we can use Lemma 3.3 to conclude the existence of a rational ray in $K(X)$.

Lemma 3.4 *Let Z be a 4-fold, $\rho(Z) = 2$, $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$ and $X \in |-K_Z|$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. Then $\partial K(Z)$ contains a rational divisor of the form $-K_Z + sH$ with $H \in \text{Pic}(Z)$ being ample and $0 \leq s \in \mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof: We divide the proof in two cases: $-K_Z$ nef and $-K_Z$ not nef.

Let us at first assume that $-K_Z$ is nef. If $-K_Z \in \partial K(Z)$, then we choose $s = 0$. Hence we assume that $-K_Z$ is ample. Now we use the cone theorem for Fano manifolds, which states the rationality of $\partial K(Z)$.

If $-K_Z$ is not nef, we apply Lemma 3.3 and see that

$$H + r(-K_Z) \in \partial K(Z) \iff H + r(-K_Z)|X \in \partial K(X),$$

if $r > 0$ and $H \in \text{Pic}(Z)$ ample. Since we assumed $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, we conclude by $X \in |-K_Z|$, that $-K_Z|X$ is effective. Now we want to use the log-rationality theorem ([KMM87, Thm 4-1-1]), which states that

$$\sup\{r \in \mathbb{R} | H + r(K_X + \Delta) \in K(X)\} \in \mathbb{Q},$$

if $H \in \text{Pic}(X)$ is ample, $K_X + \Delta$ not nef and Δ an effective $\mathbb{Q}$ -Divisor, such that (X, Δ) has only weak log-terminal singularities. The latter property is guaranteed by choosing $\varepsilon\Delta$ instead of Δ for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Note that $K_X = 0$.

Because $-K_Z|X$ is not nef, we can apply the log-rationality theorem on X for arbitrary ample H and $\Delta := \varepsilon(-K_Z|X)$ for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$ and get, that $\partial K(X)$ contains a rational ray, by Lemma 3.3 coming from a rational ray of $\partial K(Z)$. We set $s := \frac{1}{r}$. $\square$

Following a notation of P.M.H. Wilson we denote

$$W(X) := \{D \in N^1(X) | D^3 = 0\}.$$

The effective cone in $N^1(X)$ shall be named $B(X)$.

By a Lemma of Wilson in [Wi94a] we get to the following statement:

Theorem 3.5 *Let X be a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. If $D \in \partial K(X)$ and $L \in K(X)$, then the statements*

- (i) $D \in \partial K(X) \setminus W(X)$,
- (ii) $D - \epsilon L \in B(X) \setminus \overline{K(X)}$ for all $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$,
- (iii) $rD \in \partial K(X) \cap \text{Pic}(X)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{R}$

satisfy

$$(i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iii).$$

We give a short proof and point out, which part was proved by Wilson.

Proof: Let $D \in \partial K(X) \setminus W(X)$. Since $D^3 > 0$, also

$$D^2.(D + H') > 0 \text{ and } D.(D + H')^2 > 0,$$

if H' is chosen to be ample. If we set $H := D + H'$, then H is ample and satisfies

$$D^2.H > 0 \text{ and } D.H^2 > 0.$$

Hence, in a small neighbourhood of D for every $D' \in \mathbb{Q} \otimes \text{Pic}(X)$ holds

$$D'^2.H > 0 \text{ and } D'.H^2 > 0$$

Now, by a lemma of Wilson [Wi94a, Key Lemma] mD' is effective for $m \gg 0$, if D' is not nef. This proves the first implication.

To prove the second one, we use Kawamata's Rationality Theorem. Let $D' := D - \epsilon L$ for an $\epsilon \ll 1$. Then $(X, \eta D')$ has weak log-terminal singularities for $0 < \eta \ll 1$. If H is an ample divisor, the rationality theorem implies the existence of $0 < q \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that

$$D'' := H + qD' \in \partial K(X).$$

Hence, there are $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $mD'' \in \text{Pic}(X) \cap \partial K(X)$. Now, if $D, \tilde{D} \subset \partial K(X)$ generate $N^1(X)$, consider the induced scalar product

$$(aD + \tilde{a}\tilde{D}, bD + \tilde{b}\tilde{D}) := ab + \tilde{a}\tilde{b}.$$

By choosing ϵ small enough, we may assume $(D', D) > 0$. Since $D'' \in \partial K(X)$ and

$$(D'', D) = (H, D) + q(D', D) > 0,$$

we see, that there is a $r > 0$ with $mD'' = rD$. $\square$

So for proving rationality of the Kähler cone, it is enough to look at the cases $D^3 = 0$ for a $D \in \partial K(X)$. This will play a crucial role in the following. Since also $\pi^* h^3 = 0$ and $\pi^* h \in \partial K(X)$, if we additionally assume a fibration $\pi : X \rightarrow S$, we see that we can reduce then to the case $\partial K(X) \subset W(X)$. This in particular applies to our X in $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundles over $\mathbb{P}^2$.

Theorem 3.6 *Let X be a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. Then*

$$\overline{B(X)} = \overline{K(X)} \iff \partial K(X) \subset W(X).$$

Proof: In view toward Lemma 3.5, only ' $\Leftarrow$ ' has to be shown. Therefore let D, D' be cone generators of $\overline{K(X)}$ and $D^3 = D'^3 = 0$. We discriminate between two cases:

- (i) $D^2 > 0, D'^2 > 0$ and
- (ii) $D^2 > 0, D'^2 \equiv 0$.

In case i) we know $D^2 D' > 0$ and $DD'^2 > 0$, because else $D^2 \equiv 0$ or $D'^2 \equiv 0$, since $D^3 = D'^3 = 0$. If we write

$$E := \kappa D + \lambda D',$$

with $\kappa, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, for the numerical class of an effective divisor, take a look at

$$E.D^2 \geq 0 \text{ and } E.D'^2 \geq 0.$$

These inequations turn to

$$\lambda D^2 D' \geq 0 \text{ and } \kappa D'^2 D \geq 0.$$

Hence $\kappa, \lambda \geq 0$, i.e. $B(X) \subset \overline{K(X)}$.

In case ii) we look similarly at

$$E.D^2 \geq 0 \text{ and } E.D.D' \geq 0.$$

The first inequation implies by $D^2 D' > 0$ that $\lambda \geq 0$ and the second by $D'^2 D = 0$ that $\kappa \geq 0$ holds. So again $B(X) \subset \overline{K(X)}$.

Since a sufficient big multiple of an ample divisor gets effective, we also have the inclusion $K(X) \subset B(X)$. Hence we conclude $\overline{B(X)} = \overline{K(X)}$. $\square$

4 Calabi-Yau-threefolds in $\mathbb{P}^2$ -bundles over $\mathbb{P}^2$

In the following we are considering Calabi-Yau manifolds X of the form $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$, $X \in |-K_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}|$, with $\mathcal{E}$ being a rank-3-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^2$. Let us denote $p : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ the bundle projection and $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ the restriction of p to X . The hyperplane class in $\mathbb{P}^2$ is denoted by h , a fibre of p by F . Then $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) := c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - 3c_2(\mathcal{E})$ is invariant under $\mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathcal{E} \otimes L$, with L being a line bundle on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Thus we also write $\gamma(Z)$. Later we will see, that γ is a topological invariant of X . The line bundle $\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|_X$ shall be denoted by $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$.

The following sequences are the basics of all proofs:

$$0 \rightarrow T_{Z|\mathbb{P}^2} \rightarrow T_Z \rightarrow p^*T_{\mathbb{P}^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \rightarrow p^*(\mathcal{E}^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(1) \rightarrow T_{Z|\mathbb{P}^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

$$0 \rightarrow T_X \rightarrow T_Z|_X \rightarrow N_{X|Z} \rightarrow 0 \quad (3)$$

$$c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1))^3 - p^*c_1(\mathcal{E}).c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1))^2 + p^*c_2(\mathcal{E}).c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)) = 0 \quad (4)$$

if $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ and $L \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ are line bundles.

Sequence (2) is the relative Euler sequence and equation (4) defines the Chern classes of $\mathcal{E}$.

4.1 Intersection Theory and Picard Number

By using these sequences, we can calculate the intersection theory on Z resp. X :

Lemma 4.1 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$ and $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ a rank-3-bundle, $X \in |-K_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}|$ smooth. Then*

$$(i) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1))^4 = c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - c_2(\mathcal{E})$$

$$(ii) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1))^3.p^*h = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h$$

Proof: Multiplying (4) by p^*h yields (ii). Multiplying (4) by $\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$ and using (ii) yields (i). $\square$

The intersection theory and the Chern classes on X are described by the following Lemma. In particular, we prove that γ is a topological invariant of X .

Lemma 4.2 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$, $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ a rank-3-bundle, $X \in |-K_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}|$ smooth. Then*

$$(i) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(1))^3 = \gamma + c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h,$$

$$(ii) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(1))^2.\pi^*h = 2c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3,$$

$$(iii) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(1)).F = 3,$$

$$(iv) \quad c_1(\mathcal{O}_X(1)).c_2(X) = 36 + 12c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 2\gamma(Z),$$

$$(v) \quad \pi^*h.c_2(X) = 36,$$

$$(vi) \quad c_3(X) = -6\gamma - 162; \text{ in particular } \gamma \geq -27, \text{ if } \rho(X) = 2.$$

Proof: Tedious calculations. The last part $\gamma \geq -27$, follows by $c_3(X) = 2(\rho(X) - h^{1,2}(X)) \leq 4$. $\square$

Finally, we want to give a criterion for our assumption of $\rho(X) = 2$ to be true.

Theorem 4.3 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ being a rank-3-bundle. If $-K_Z$ is big and nef, then*

$$\rho(X) = 2 + h^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}).$$

In particular, $\rho(X) = 2$, if $-K_Z$ is big and nef and the generic splitting type (e_1, e_2, e_3) (with $e_1 \leq e_2 \leq e_3$) of $\mathcal{E}$ is not $(0, 0, 3)$ (in the normalization $c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h \in \{1, 2, 3\}$).

Proof: We look at the two sequences

$$0 \rightarrow N_{X|Z}^\vee \rightarrow \Omega_Z|X \rightarrow \Omega_X \rightarrow 0 \quad (5)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_Z \otimes K_Z \rightarrow \Omega_Z \rightarrow \Omega_Z|X \rightarrow 0. \quad (6)$$

Our first aim is to show $H^i(T_Z) = H^i(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})$ for $i > 1$. For this purpose we calculate $R^i p_*(p^*(\mathcal{E}^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(1)) = \mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes R^i p_* \mathcal{O}_Z(1) = 0$ for $i > 0$. Therefore the Leray spectral sequence yields

$$H^i(p^*(\mathcal{E}^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(1)) = H^i(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}).$$

Sequence (2) shows, that $H^i(p^*(\mathcal{E}^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z(1)) = H^i(T_{Z|\mathbb{P}^2})$ for $i > 0$, since by $R^i p_* \mathcal{O}_Z = 0$ for $i > 0$ we get $H^i(\mathcal{O}_Z) = H^i(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = 0$ for $i > 0$. For applying (1), we verify by the projection formula $R^i p_* p^* T_{\mathbb{P}^2} = 0$ for $i > 0$. Hence again the Leray spectral sequence implies

$$H^i(p^* T_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = H^i(T_{\mathbb{P}^2}) = 0$$

for $i > 0$. This implies with (1) now, that

$$H^i(T_{Z|\mathbb{P}^2}) = H^i(T_Z)$$

for $i > 1$. Therefore

$$H^i(T_Z) = H^i(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})$$

for $i > 1$.

So we see that

$$H^i(\Omega_Z \otimes K_Z) = H^{4-i}(T_Z)^\vee = H^{4-i}(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^\vee$$

for $i < 3$. In particular,

$$H^1(\Omega_Z \otimes K_Z) = H^3(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^\vee = 0.$$

Since $H^{2,1}(Z) = 0$ and $N_{X|Z}^\vee = K_Z|X$ the cohomology sequences of (5) and (6) contain

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Z) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Z|X) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})^\vee \rightarrow 0 \quad (7)$$

resp.

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(K_Z|X) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_Z|X) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_X) \rightarrow H^2(K_Z|X). \quad (8)$$

Since $-K_Z$ was assumed to be big and nef, $H^i(K_Z|X) = 0$ holds for $i < 3$ and by (8) and (7) therefore

$$\rho(X) = h^1(\Omega_Z|X) = \rho(Z) + h^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}).$$

To prove the second part, we show at first, that $\rho(X) = 2$, if the generic splitting type (e_1, e_2, e_3) of $\mathcal{E}$ (with $e_1 \leq e_2 \leq e_3$) satisfies the condition $e_3 - e_1 < 3$. This we see in this way: an element $0 \neq t \in H^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E})$ induces via Serre duality (after choice of a basis of $H^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-3))^\vee$) a section $s \in H^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-3)), s \neq 0$. This section cannot vanish on the general line L , hence induces a section $0 \neq s \in H^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-3)|L)$. This is possible, only if $e_3 - e_1 \geq 3$.

Since $-K_Z$ is big and nef it follows that $-K_Z|p^*L$ is nef, in particular

$$0 \leq -K_Z \cdot \mathbb{P}_L(\mathcal{O}(e_1)) = 3e_1 + 3 - e_1 - e_2 - e_3 = 2e_1 + 3 - e_2 - e_3$$

and therefore $e_3 - e_1 \geq 3$ only, if $e_2 = e_1, e_3 = e_1 + 3$. □

Example 4.4 ($\rho(X) \neq 2$) Have a look at $\mathcal{E} = 2\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(3)$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is globally generated and since $-K_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(3)$, also $-K_Z$ is globally generated. This proves the existence of smooth Calabi-Yau threefolds in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. Because $(-K_Z)^4 = 81(c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - c_2(\mathcal{E})) = 729 > 0$ (see Lemma 4.1), $-K_Z$ is big and nef, hence $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.3. Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E} = 2\mathcal{O}(-3) \oplus 5\mathcal{O} \oplus 2\mathcal{O}(3)$$

and hence $h^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = 2$, what means $\rho(X) = 4$. △

Example 4.5 ($\rho(X) = 2$) Theorem 4.3 shows also, that $\rho(X) = 2$, if $\mathcal{E}$ is one of the following:

- (i) $\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b), 0 \leq a \leq b \leq 2, a + b \leq 3$,
- (ii) $T_{\mathbb{P}^3}|_{\mathbb{P}^2}$,
- (iii) $T_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}$.

△

4.2 The generalized Kollár Lemma

We get the following generalization of Kollár's Lemma:

Theorem 4.6 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$, with $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ being a rank-3-bundle, and $\rho(X) = 2$. Then*

$$K(X) = K(Z)|X$$

holds, unless:

$-K_Z$ is big and nef, but not ample, $-K_Z|X$ is ample and there is a surface $G \subset Z$ such that $X \cap G = \emptyset$ and

$$[\mu G] = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - (6c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h + 9)\mathcal{O}_Z(1) \cdot p^*h + (9c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h + 9 - 2c_1^2(\mathcal{E}))F$$

for a certain $\mu > 0$.

This Theorem is a crucial step on the way to the proof of the rationality of $\partial K(X)$. Its proof will be divided into an ascending sequence of lemmata. For simplicity, let us denote

- (A) $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a rank-3-bundle, $Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, $X \subset |-K_Z|$ is a Calabi-Yau-manifold with $\rho(X) = 2$ and $-K_Z$ is big and nef, but not ample.

Lemma 4.7 *In situation (A) holds: If $\Phi_{|-mK_Z|} : Z \longrightarrow Z'$ contracts only finitely many curves, then these are smooth and rational.*

Proof: Let C be an irreducible contracted curve. Since $-mK_Z = \Phi^*\mathcal{O}_{Z'}(1)$ we have $-mK_{Z'} = \mathcal{O}_{Z'}(1)$ and Z' has only canonical singularities, in particular they are rational. Hence $R^1\Phi_*\mathcal{O}_Z = 0$ and by

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

we also get $R^1\Phi_*\mathcal{O}_C = 0$. By the Leray spectral sequence we conclude $H^1(\mathcal{O}_C) = 0$. Hence C is smooth and rational. $\square$

Lemma 4.8 *In situation (A) holds: The exceptional locus of $\Phi_{|-mK_Z|} : Z \longrightarrow Z'$ contains a two-dimensional component.*

Proof: We assume, Φ contracts only (rational) curves and $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ is such a curve. By the adjunction formula and $K_Z.C = 0$ we get $c_1(N_{C|Z}) = c_1(K_C) = -2$. Now we compute

$$\chi(N_{C|Z}) = 3(1 - g(C)) + c_1(N_{C|Z}) = 1 > 0$$

and therefore C deforms in Z , hence there is a contracted surface, which contradicts our assumption. $\square$

Lemma 4.9 *In situation (A) holds:*

$$H^4(Z, \mathbb{Z}) = \langle F, \mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h, \mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 \rangle.$$

Proof: By the Künneth formula we already know that $b_4(Z) = 3$.

To show that $v_1 := F, v_2 := \mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h$ and $v_3 := \mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2$ are a $\mathbb{Z}$ -Basis for $H^4(Z, \mathbb{Z})$ reduces to showing that the matrix $A = (a_{ij}) = (v_i.v_j)$ is invertible over $\mathbb{Z}$. But by Lemma 4.1 we know, that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \\ 1 & c_1(\mathcal{E}).h & c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - c_2(\mathcal{E}) \end{pmatrix}$$

so the Lemma is proven. $\square$

Lemma 4.10 *In situation (A) holds: If $\Phi_{|-mK_Z|}|X : X \longrightarrow X'$ is an isomorphism, then the exceptional locus of Φ is two-dimensional and is contracted to a finite number of points. If G is such a contracted surface, then*

$$[\mu G] = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - (6c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9)\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h + (9c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9 - 2c_1^2(\mathcal{E}))F$$

for a $\mu > 0$.

Proof: Let $E \longrightarrow V$ be the exceptional locus of Φ . Since $-K_Z = \Phi^*\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{m})$ as a $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor we have

$$mX = \Phi^*H$$

for an ample $H \subset Z'$ and $m > 0$. Since H is ample, H intersects with each positive-dimensional component of V . This implies, that $\Phi|_X$ can be an isomorphism only, if $\dim V = 0$.

By Lemma 4.8 the exceptional locus of Φ is at least two-dimensional.

Let us assume there is a divisor D , which is contracted to a point by Φ . Then $D = \kappa\mathcal{O}_Z(1) + \lambda\pi^*h$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} -K_Z.D.F &= 3\kappa \\ -K_Z.D.\mathcal{O}_Z(1).\pi^*h &= 3\kappa c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + \kappa(3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h) + 3\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Because D is contracted to a point, $-K_Z.D \equiv 0$. Both equations imply now $\kappa = \lambda = 0$. So there is only the case left, that Φ is small.

Now let $G \subset Z$ be an irreducible surface, which is contracted to a point by Φ . By Lemma 4.9 we can write G as

$$G = \kappa\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 + \eta\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h + \lambda F.$$

Since $\Phi|_X$ is assumed to be an isomorphism, this means, that $-K_Z.G \equiv 0$. This leads to equations $-K_Z.G.\mathcal{O}_Z(1) = 0$ and $-K_Z.G.p^*h = 0$, or in terms of κ, η, λ

$$\begin{aligned} (2c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) - 3c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h)\kappa + (2c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3)\eta + 3\lambda &= 0 \\ (2c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3)\kappa + 3\eta &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Solving this system leads to

$$\mu G = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - (6c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9)\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h + [9c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9 - 2c_1^2(\mathcal{E})]F$$

for a $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Positivity of μ is a consequence of $G.F \geq 0$. □

Now we finally can prove Theorem 4.6:

Proof: [of Thm 4.6] Let us assume $K(X) = K(Z)|_X$ does not hold. Since p^*h and π^*h are nef and not ample, the properties $K(X) \neq K(Z)|_X$ and $\rho(X) = 2$ imply in view to Lemma 3.3 and the Kollár Lemma that the divisor $-K_Z|_X$ is ample and $-K_Z$ big and nef, but not ample. By

$$0 \longrightarrow (-K_Z)^{\otimes(m-1)} \longrightarrow (-K_Z)^{\otimes m} \longrightarrow (-K_Z)^{\otimes m}|_X \longrightarrow 0$$

and $H^1((1-m)K_Z) = 0$ (Kawamata-Viehweg), we see that

$$H^0(-mK_Z) \longrightarrow H^0(-mK_Z|_X)$$

is surjective. Hence $\Phi_{|-mK_Z|_X} = \Phi_{|-mK_Z|}|_X$. Since $-K_Z|_X$ is ample, this means that $\Phi_{|-mK_Z|}|_X$ is an isomorphism. Therefore we conclude by Lemma 4.10 the existence of a surface as described. □

4.3 The rationality of the Kähler cone

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.4 we get

Lemma 4.11 *Let $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rank-3-bundle and $Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. If $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$ and there is a Calabi-Yau threefold $X \subset Z$ with $\rho(X) = 2$, then $\partial K(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ is rational.*

Finally, we need a computational result on global sections:

Lemma 4.12 *Let $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ a rank-3-bundle, $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. If $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ is ample and $-K_Z$ is nef, then*

- (i) $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq -1$,
- (ii) $h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) \geq \frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h$,
- (iii) if $\frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h > 0$, then $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq 1$.

Proof: A standard computation yields

$$0 < \mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2.p^*h|X = 3\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^3.\pi^*h + (3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h)\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2.F = 2c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3,$$

what implies $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq -1$. Therefore the first part is proven. By the nefness of $-K_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(3) + (3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h)p^*h$ we get furthermore, that $\mathcal{O}_Z(3) + 4p^*h$ is nef.

For a line L in $\mathbb{P}^2$ we have the ideal sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(1)|\pi^*L \longrightarrow 0.$$

This implies

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) \geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)|\pi^*L).$$

The sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(1) + K_Z|p^*L \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(1)|p^*L \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(1)|\pi^*L$$

shows by

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1) + K_Z|p^*L) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(-2) + (3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h)p^*h|p^*L) = 0$$

and

$$H^1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1) + K_Z|p^*L) = H^1(p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z(-2) + (3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h)p^*h|p^*L)) = 0,$$

because $R^1p_*(\mathcal{O}_Z(1) + K_Z|p^*L) = 0$, that

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|p^*L) \cong H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)|\pi^*L).$$

The lefthand side is easy to compute: since $L \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, $\mathcal{E}|L$ splits, hence we can write

$$\mathcal{E}|L = \mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b) \oplus \mathcal{O}(c) \text{ with } a \leq b \leq c.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}_Z(3) + 4p^*h|p^*L$ is nef, $\mathcal{O}_Z(3) + 6p^*h|p^*L$ is ample and therefore $\mathcal{O}_Z(1) + 2p^*h|p^*L$ is ample, what is the definition of $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}(2)|L$ being ample. This implies $a \geq -1$.

If $a \geq 0$, then $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|p^*L) = h^0(\mathcal{E}|L) = a + b + c + 3 = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3$.

If $a = -1, b \geq 0$, then $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|p^*L) = b + c + 2 = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3$.

Finally, if $a = -1, b = -1, c > 0$, then $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|p^*L) = c + 1 = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3$ again.

Because $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ is ample, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) &= \chi(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) \\
&= \frac{1}{6}\mathcal{O}_X(1)^3 + \frac{1}{12}\mathcal{O}_X(1).c_2(X) \\
&= \frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{3}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) &\geq h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) - h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)|\pi^*L) \\
&= \frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{3}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h - 3 \\
&= \frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h
\end{aligned}$$

If the right hand side is positive, $\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h$ is effective, and hence

$$0 < \mathcal{O}_X(1).(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h).\pi^*h = 2c_1(\mathcal{E}).h.$$

This proves the last part of the theorem. $\square$

Now we are in a comfortable situation. If we assume $\partial K(X)$ to be not rational and $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, then by Lemma 4.11 we know that

$$K(X) \neq K(Z)|X.$$

Hence, by Theorem 4.6 we get, that

$$\begin{aligned}
(irr_+) \quad & -K_Z \text{ is big and nef, not ample, } -K_Z|X \text{ is ample and} \\
(irr_G) \quad & \text{there is a surface } G \subset Z \text{ with } X \cap G = \emptyset \text{ which is of} \\
& \text{cohomological class} \\
& [\mu G] = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - (6c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9)\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h \\
& + (9c_2(\mathcal{E}) + 3c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 9 - 2c_1^2(\mathcal{E}))F \\
& \text{for a } \mu > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmata 3.5 and 3.6 we furthermore can apply, that

$$(irr_{eff}) \quad \overline{B(X)} = \overline{K(X)} \text{ and } D^3 = 0 \text{ if } D \in \partial K(X).$$

This is essentially the knowledge of the situation. For the sake of shortness, we denote

$$\begin{aligned}
(irr) \quad & \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2 \text{ is a rank-3-bundle, } Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}), X \subset |-K_Z| \text{ is a} \\
& \text{Calabi-Yau-manifold with } \rho(X) = 2, h^0(-K_Z) > 1 \text{ and} \\
& \partial K(X) \text{ is not rational.}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, denote

$$\begin{aligned}
(irr^0) \quad & (irr) \text{ and } \mathcal{E} \text{ is normalized such that } \mathcal{O}_X(1) \text{ is ample,} \\
& \text{but } \mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h \text{ is not.}
\end{aligned}$$

We are now going to apply the items above, which are implied by (irr) .

Lemma 4.13 (irr) implies $-18 < \gamma \leq 1$.

Proof: Since $-K_Z$ is big and nef, we know

$$0 < (-K_Z)^4 = 27\gamma + 486,$$

what means $\gamma > -18$. If we set $D := \mathcal{O}_Z(3) - kp^*h$ for a $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $D^3 = 0$ and $D \in \partial K(X)$ we compute

$$k = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + \frac{3}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \gamma}.$$

Since there has to be a solution in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, we conclude $\gamma \leq 1$. $\square$

Lemma 4.14 (*irr⁰*) *implies $-1 \leq c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \leq 4$ and for every line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ the type of $\mathcal{E}|L$ is contained in the following tabular:*

$c_1(\mathcal{E})$	$\mathcal{E} L$
-1	$(-1, -1, 1), (-1, 0, 0)$
0	$(-1, 0, 1), (0, 0, 0)$
1	$(0, 0, 1)$
2	$(0, 0, 2), (0, 1, 1)$
3	$(0, 1, 2), (1, 1, 1)$
4	$(1, 1, 2)$

Proof: By Lemma 3.6 we know that

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) = 0.$$

The condition

$$h^0(-K_Z) \geq 2$$

moreover implies then that

$$H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1) - \pi^*h) = 0.$$

Now we apply Lemma 4.12 and get

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) \geq \frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h.$$

Since we know by Lemma 4.13 that $-18 < \gamma \leq 1$, we conclude

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h) > 0,$$

if $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq 5$. By Lemma 4.12 we know on the other hand $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq -1$. Hence only the cases

$$-1 \leq c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \leq 4 \tag{9}$$

remain.

Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a line. Then

$$\mathcal{E}|L = \mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b) \oplus \mathcal{O}(c)$$

with $a \leq b \leq c$. We call $\mathcal{E}|L$ 'of type (a, b, c) '. Since $-K_Z$ is big and nef, we can compute

$$0 \leq -K_Z.\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a)) = 3a + 3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}).h$$

and therefore

$$a \geq \lceil \frac{1}{3}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h - 1 \rceil \geq -1 \tag{10}$$

Let us assume, $-K_Z \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(b)) = 0$ holds. Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(b))$ is contained in the exceptional locus of $\Phi|_{-mK_Z}$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(b))$ deforms in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b))$, this implies that $G := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b))$ is a surface in the exceptional locus. Since $K(X) \neq K(Z)|_X$, we can apply Lemma 4.10 and get $-K_Z \cdot G \equiv 0$. We get a contradiction by computing

$$-K_Z \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b)) \cdot p^*h = (\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b))}(3) + (3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h)F) \cdot F = 3,$$

where F denotes the class of a fibre of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}(b)) \rightarrow L$.

Hence $-K_Z \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(b)) > 0$. Again we have

$$-K_Z \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}(b)) = 3b + 3 - c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 0 &\Rightarrow b \geq 0 \\ c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 3h &\Rightarrow b \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The conditions (9),(10),(11) together with $a \leq b \leq c$ yield the tabulated cases. $\square$

Theorem 4.15 *Let $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rank-3-bundle, $Z := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, $X \subset |-K_Z|$ a Calabi-Yau manifold with $\rho(X) = 2$ and $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$. Then $\partial K(X)$ is rational.*

Proof: The statement is, that (irr) and therefore (irr^0) is impossible. So let us assume, (irr^0) holds for some fixed $\mathcal{E}$, X and Z . Then we can apply Lemma 4.14 and lead the cases $c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h = -1, \dots, 4$ to a contradiction separately.

If $c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h \in \{1, 4\}$, then by Lemma 4.14 we see, that $\mathcal{E}$ is uniform. This implies (e.g. by [OSS88]) that $\mathcal{E}$ is

- $T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}$ or $\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)$ (for $c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h = 1$), resp.
- $T_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1)$ or $\mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(2)$ (for $c_1(\mathcal{E}) \cdot h = 4$).

Both cases imply the same Z 's, hence only one of them could be true. But since $-K_Z$ is ample for all those bundles, we get the rationality of $\partial K(X)$ by the Kollár Lemma. This is a contradiction.

To exclude $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = -1$, we compute

$$\chi(m(-K_Z|X - 4\pi^*h)) = \left(\frac{9}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) - 9\right)m^3 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + 6\right)m < 0$$

for $m \gg 0$. Since $\mathcal{O}_X(3) = -K_Z|X - 4\pi^*h$ is ample, we have

$$\chi(m(-K_Z|X - 4\pi^*h)) = h^0(m(-K_Z|X - 4\pi^*h)) > 0,$$

what is a contradiction.

Similarly, if we assume $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 0$, then $-K_Z|X - 3\pi^*h = \mathcal{O}_X(3)$ is ample and we get again the condition

$$\chi(m(-K_Z|X - 3\pi^*h)) = \frac{9}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E})m^3 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + 9\right)m > 0$$

for $m \gg 0$. This implies $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$. Since $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ and $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) \leq 1$, it follows that $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) = 0$. But in this case $W = \{\mathbb{R}\pi^*h, \mathbb{R}\mathcal{O}_X(1), \mathbb{R}(\mathcal{O}_X(1) - \pi^*h)\}$ is rational and by (irr_{eff}) we conclude that $\partial K(X)$ is rational.

In the case $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 2h$ we have that

$$-K_Z|X = \mathcal{O}_X(3) + \pi^*h$$

and $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ are ample, hence

$$\chi(m(-K_Z|X - \pi^*h)) = \left(\frac{9}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + 45\right)m^3 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + 15\right)m > 0$$

for $m \gg 0$, what implies

$$\frac{9}{2}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + 45 \geq 0,$$

therefore $\gamma(\mathcal{E}) \geq -10$.

Similarly to the cases $c_1 = -1, 0$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)) &= h^0(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) \\ &= \chi(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}\mathcal{O}_X(1)^3 + \frac{1}{12}\mathcal{O}_X(1).c_2(X) \\ &= \frac{1}{3}\gamma(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{20}{3} \\ &\geq 4 \end{aligned}$$

and again we can conclude by $\overline{K(X)} = \overline{B(X)}$ and $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$ like in the proof of Lemma 4.14 that

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1) - p^*h) = 0.$$

In particular every $D \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|$ is irreducible.

Now, according to (irr_G) there is a surface $G \subset Z$, such that

$$-K_Z.G \equiv 0.$$

Since $-K_Z = \mathcal{O}_Z(3) + p^*h$ and G cannot contain any curve in a fibre (else $0 = -K_Z.C = p^*h.C$ for such a curve), for every curve $C \subset G$ holds

$$\mathcal{O}_Z(1).C < 0$$

and therefore $C \subset Bs(\mathcal{O}_Z(1))$, where Bs denotes the base locus of a linear system. If we now choose $D, D' \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|$, then

$$G \subset Bs(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)) \subset D \cap D'.$$

Since $D \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|$ is irreducible and $h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)) > 1$, it follows that $D \cap D'$ is twodimensional, hence G is a component of $D \cap D'$.

According to Thm 4.6 the cohomological class of G is

$$[\mu G] = 9\mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2 - 3\mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h + (19 - 3\gamma(\mathcal{E}))F$$

and therefore

$$9 = \mu G.F \leq \mu \mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2.F = \mu.$$

This implies $\mu = 9$, because $G.F \in \mathbb{Z}$. According to Lemma 4.9 the set $\{F, \mathcal{O}_Z(1).p^*h, \mathcal{O}_Z(1)^2\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of $H^4(Z, \mathbb{Z})$, hence also holds

$$\mu |gcd(9, 3, 19 - 3\gamma(\mathcal{E})) = 1,$$

contradicting $\mu = 9$.

Let us turn our attention to the last case $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 3h$. Then $-K_Z|_X = \mathcal{O}_X(3)$ is ample and by Lemma 4.14 the splitting type of $\mathcal{E}$ can only be $(0, 1, 2)$ or $(1, 1, 1)$.

Let G be an exceptional surface as in Theorem 4.6 resp. Lemma 4.10. Since again

$$h^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_X(1)) = \frac{\gamma}{3} + 9 \geq 4$$

by $\gamma > -18$, and the arguments, which show that $D \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|$ is irreducible, apply here as well as in the case $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 2h$, we can choose $D, D' \in |\mathcal{O}_Z(1)|$ which are irreducible and intersect with G . But since $\mathcal{O}_Z(3) = \Phi^*H$ we also conclude, that

$$D = \Phi^*A, D' = \Phi^*A'$$

for ample divisors A, A' . Hence $D \cap G \neq \emptyset$ implies by Lemma 4.10 that $G \subset D$, and therefore

$$G \subset D \cap D'.$$

As before we conclude that $\mu = 9$ and G cannot contain any curve in a fibre of p . This sums up to showing that G is a section of p and hence given by an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0$$

via $G = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F})$.

By the tangent sequence of G and the property $-K_Z.G \equiv 0$ we compute $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}$.

But this implies that $\mathcal{O}_L$ is a quotient bundle if $\mathcal{E}|_L$ for any line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, what excludes the case $\mathcal{E}|_L = 3\mathcal{O}(1)$. Hence $\mathcal{E}$ is uniform of splitting type $(0, 1, 2)$. This amounts to determining $\mathcal{E}$ as

- $\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(2)$, or
- $T_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}$, or
- $T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(2)$, or
- $S^2(T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-1))$.

In the first case $\gamma = 3$, contradicting $\gamma \leq 1$. In the second and third case $\gamma = 0$, hence $W(X)$ and therefore also $\partial K(X)$ are rational (arguments like above). In the fourth case, by using the Euler sequence and its derived sequences by taking S^2 of it, we compute $\gamma = -9$. This we lead to a contradiction by the following arguments.

Let $D := \mathcal{O}_X(3) - k\pi^*h \in \partial K(X)$. Since $D^3 = 0$ we get like before

$$k = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + \frac{3}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{9}{4} + 9} = c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{5} < c_1(\mathcal{E}).h - \frac{3}{2} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

Therefore for $D' := \mathcal{O}_Z(2) - p^*h$ the restriction $D'|_X$ is not nef, and because of (*irref*) we conclude that it is also not effective. On the other hand we have

$$H^0(D') = H^0(D'|_X).$$

But

$$H^0(D') = H^0(S^2\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1)) = H^0(S^2S^2T_{\mathbb{P}^2} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-5))$$

and we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (\det \mathcal{H})^{\otimes 2} \longrightarrow S^2 S^2 \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow S^4 \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow 0$$

for a rank-2-bundle $\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, where the projection is given by

$$(t_i t_j)(t_k t_l) \mapsto t_i t_j t_k t_l.$$

This yields, tensored with $\mathcal{O}(-5)$ and applied to $\mathcal{H} = T_{\mathbb{P}^2}$,

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1) \longrightarrow S^2 \mathcal{E}(-1) \longrightarrow S^4 T_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-5) \longrightarrow 0,$$

what implies

$$h^0(D') = h^0(\mathcal{O}(1)) = 3,$$

what contradicts to *(irreffe)* by the previous calculation.

This finishes the proof. $\square$

The only case for which we do not know the rationality of $\partial K(X)$, is $h^0(-K_Z) = 1$. But we can give a bound Γ for γ , such that $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, whenever $\gamma \geq \Gamma$.

Theorem 4.16 *Let $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ a rank-3-bundle, $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) =: Z$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$. If $\gamma(Z) \geq -18$, then $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$, in particular $\partial K(X)$ is rational.*

Proof: The sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow -K_Z \longrightarrow N_{X|Z} \longrightarrow 0$$

implies, that

$$h^0(-K_Z) > 1 \iff h^0(N_{X|Z}) > 0. \quad (12)$$

The tangent sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_X \longrightarrow T_Z|X \longrightarrow N_{X|Z} \longrightarrow 0$$

yields that

$$h^0(N_{X|Z}) \geq h^0(T_Z|X) \quad (13)$$

and

$$h^0(N_{X|Z}) \geq h^1(T_X) - h^1(T_Z|X). \quad (14)$$

Finally, the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_Z \otimes K_Z \longrightarrow T_Z \longrightarrow T_Z|X \longrightarrow 0, \quad (15)$$

the relative tangent sequence and the relative Euler sequence allow the statement

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(T_Z|X) &\geq h^0(T_Z) - h^0(T_Z \otimes K_Z) \\ &= h^0(T_Z) - h^4(\Omega_Z) \\ &= h^0(T_Z) \\ &\geq h^0(T_Z|_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \\ &\geq h^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

If $h^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) > 1$, then by (13) and (12) also $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$ is proven.

So let us assume $h^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = 1$. Now we have a closer look at (14). The ideal sequence of $X \subset Z$, the relative tangent sequence of $Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ and the relative Euler sequence imply, that

$$\begin{aligned} h^1(T_Z|X) &\leq h^1(T_Z) + h^2(T_Z \otimes K_Z) \\ &= h^1(T_Z) + h^2(\Omega_Z) \\ &= h^1(T_Z) \\ &\leq h^1(T_{Z|\mathbb{P}^2}) + h^1(T_{\mathbb{P}^2}) \\ &\leq h^1(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $h^0(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = 1$, we get $h^2(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = 0$ and

$$h^1(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = 1 - \chi(\mathcal{E}^\vee \otimes \mathcal{E}) = -2\gamma - 8.$$

Furthermore we know that

$$h^1(T_X) = 2 - \frac{1}{2}c_3(X) = 3\gamma + 83,$$

therefore

$$h^0(N_{X|Z}) \geq 5\gamma + 91 > 0,$$

since we assumed $\gamma \geq -18$. □

Remark 4.17 *If $-K_Z$ is nef, then*

$$0 \leq (-K_Z)^4 = 27\gamma + 486,$$

i.e.

$$\gamma \geq -18.$$

Hence we can apply Theorem 4.16 and get, that $\partial K(X)$ is rational.

4.4 The positivity of $c_2(X)$

In this last section we want to verify the positivity of $c_2(X)$ and therefore confirm the conjecture of Wilson for the Calabi-Yau threefolds considered in this section in the case $h^0(-K_Z) > 1$.

Theorem 4.18 *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ a Calabi-Yau threefold with $\rho(X) = 2$, where $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a rank-3-bundle. Then*

$$D.c_2(X) > 0 \text{ for all } D \in \overline{K(X)}.$$

Proof: Again we choose $\mathcal{E}$ in such a way that $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ is nef, but $\mathcal{O}_X(1) - p^*h$ is not. Hence there is a $k \in [0; 1[$ such that $D := \mathcal{O}_X(1) - k\pi^*h \in \partial K(X)$. We know $D^3 \geq 0$. This is a condition, only if $\gamma \leq 2$, and then this means

$$k \leq \frac{1}{3}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \gamma},$$

In the case $\gamma \leq 2$ we compute

$$D.c_2(X) = 36 + 12c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 2\gamma - 36k \geq 18 + 2\gamma + 12\sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \gamma}.$$

Using $\gamma \geq -27$, we see $D.c_2 > 0$ (the only zero of $18 + 2\gamma + 12\sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \gamma}$ is $\gamma = -54$).

If $\gamma \geq 3$ we distinguish between two cases: $-K_Z$ is nef and $-K_Z$ is not nef. Using the formulas of Lemma 4.2, we get:

$$-K_Z|X.c_2(X) = 6\gamma + 216 > 0,$$

since $\gamma \geq -27$. By Lemma 4.2 we already know

$$\pi^*h.c_2(X) = 36 > 0.$$

If $-K_Z$ is not nef, then $-K_Z|X = N_{X|Z}$ is not nef. Hence $-K_Z|X + r\pi^*h \in \partial K(X)$ for a $r > 0$ and hence $D.c_2(X) > 0$.

So let us assume that $-K_Z$ is nef. We are able to restrict to $k > 0$, since in the case $k = 0$ we get $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq -1$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.12 and

$$D.c_2 = 36 + 12c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 2\gamma \geq 30 > 0.$$

If now $k > 0$, also by $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq -1$ and $\gamma \geq 3$ we verify

$$\frac{1}{3}\gamma + \frac{1}{6}c_1^2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(\mathcal{E}).h > 0$$

and hence get by Lemma 4.12 that $c_1(\mathcal{E}).h \geq 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D.c_2 &= 36 + 12c_1(\mathcal{E}).h + 2\gamma - 36k \\ &\geq 48 + 2\gamma - 36k \geq 12 + 2\gamma > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\pi^*h.c_2(X) = 36 > 0,$$

the proof is finished. $\square$

References

- [Bo89] Borcea, C.: Homogeneous vector Bundles and Families of Calabi-Yau Threefolds. II, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. **52**, 1991, Part 2, p.83-91
- [KMM87] Kawamata, Y., Matsuda, K., Matsuki, K.: Introduction to the Minimal Model Problem, Adv. Studies in Pure Math. **10**, 1987, 283-360
- [Og93] Oguiso, K.: On algebraic fiber space structures on a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, Int. J. of Math. **4**, 439-465 (1993)
- [OSS88] Okonek, Ch., Schneider, M., Spindler H.: Vector bundles on Complex Projective Spaces, Boston (1988)
- [Wi94a] Wilson, P.M.H.: The existence of elliptic fibre space structures on Calabi-Yau threefolds, Math. Ann. **300**, No.4, 693-703 (1994)

- [Wi94b] Wilson, P.M.H.: Minimal models of Calabi-Yau threefolds, in: Ciliberto, C. (Hrsg.): Classification of algebraic varieties, Algebraic Geometry Conference on Classification of Algebraic Varieties (1992, L'Aquila), Contemporary Mathematics Vol. **162** Providence, RI, 1994